



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,871	03/28/2001	Bipin Mukherji		1054

7590 11/05/2003  
Matthew F. Jodziewicz, Esq.  
Suite 836  
3660 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90010

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TU T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,871

Applicant(s)

MUKHERJI, BIPIN

Examiner

Tu T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Detailed Office Action

*Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Claim Objections*

Claim 21 is a duplication of claim 11.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2,4-10,12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-2,4-10,12-21, the phrase "video based coordinate measuring system" is not clear. Does applicant means "measuring the position of the video based on a coordinate measuring system"?

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castore et al (5,712,706) in view of Matsumoto et al (2001/0005204).

With respect to claims 2,10,18, Castore discloses a video inspection system. The system comprises: a moveable carriage 120, 122 (fig 3) for supporting a sample 110 (fig 3), a horizontally movable 160 (fig 3) detecting system 100 (fig 3), a base 140 (fig 3).

Castore does not explicitly disclose a video monitor and a display. Since Castore discloses analyzing the digital images (abstract) and using video for capturing the image and displaying the image on the screen would have been known in the art as disclosed in columns 1-2), it would have been obvious to modify Castore with the known video and the known display to facilitate the inspection.

Castore does not explicitly disclose the carriage which can be moved vertically. However, Castore discloses adding additional motion stage for providing additional degree of movement (column 5, lines 25-35) and discloses moving the test object in a path that is depended on its geometry (column 10, lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to modify Castore's system with a known vertical movable stage to inspect different object shape.

Castore does not discloses a camera based on a coordinate measuring system.

Matsumoto discloses a camera based on a coordinate measuring system (paragraph [0387]). It would have been obvious to modify Castore with Matsumoto's camera system to detect the position of the object more accurate.

With respect to claims 3,11,21, since Matsumoto discloses a camera based on a coordinate measuring system (paragraph [0387]), Matsumoto would inherently discloses measuring the position of the video.

With respect to claims 4-7,12-15,19-20, Castore does not disclose a feed, a lock, a carriage feed, a carriage lock mechanisms. However, the claimed limitations would have been known. It would have been obvious to modify Castore's system with the known claimed limitations to make the system more accurate.

With respect to claims 8-9,16-17, Castore discloses a laser source 550 (fig 5a). Further, the skill artisan would have been motivated to modify Castore's system with a plurality of lights to illuminate the object with different angles.

With respect to claim 1, claim 1 would be allowable if Applicant amend the claim to overcome the U.S.C. 112 rejection above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9185. The

examiner can normally be reached on T-F 7:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G Font can be reached on (703) 308-4881. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



**Tu T. Nguyen**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Group Art Unit 2877**

11/01/03